



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,454	04/12/2006	Ko Inagaki	2006-0418A	3144
52349	7590	05/13/2009	EXAMINER	
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK L.L.P. 1030 15th Street, N.W. Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503			STIMPERT, PHILIP EARL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3746	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/575,454	INAGAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Philip Stimpert	3746	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 February 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 April 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The examiner withdraws the objection to Figs. 9 and 10, and acknowledges the replacement drawing sheets as complying with the required labeling.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US patent 6,361,290 to Ide (Ide).

4. Regarding claim 1, Ide teaches a hermetic compressor (see Fig. 12) comprising a hermetic container (1) storing an oil (23), and a compression element (2) accommodated in the hermetic container (1) and compressing a refrigerant gas (see col. 10, ln. 61). Ide teaches that the compressing element (2) comprises a compressing chamber (21), a cylinder (4) forming the compressing chamber (21), a piston (5) inserted into the cylinder (4) and reciprocating, a suction muffler (8) whose one end (8b) communicates (col. 11, ln. 38-42) with the compression chamber (21). Further, Ide teaches that the suction muffler (8) has a sound deadening space (the cavity discussed in col. 12, ln. 28 and visible in the drawings, for instance Fig. 1), a gas flow forming part (8a or 8b, as shown in Fig. 1) forming a gas flow flowing in a constant direction (namely into or out of the muffler 8, parallel to the axis of the relevant port) in the sound

deadening space. The examiner notes that “a thin part” is extremely broad, and reads on the sound deadening space as a whole. The inlet and outlet pipe openings are thus considered to be provided at a thin part of the sound deadening space. Finally, Ide teach an oil discharge opening (col. 12, ln. 65 through col. 13, ln. 2) provided at a lower part of the sound deadening space (and therefore in a downstream side, since the flow starts at the top of the sound deadening space at inlet 8a).

5. Regarding claim 2, Ide teaches an inlet pipe (8a) whose one (interior) end opens to the sound deadening space, and whose other end opens to the hermetic container (1, see Fig. 13). Further, the inlet pipe (8a) is located on a right end face of the sound deadening space (as shown in Fig. 1) and thereby constitutes the gas flow forming part.

6. Regarding claim 3, Ide teaches an outlet pipe (8b, see Fig. 1) whose one (upper) end opens to the sound deadening space and whose other (lower) end opens to the compressing chamber (21), and that the outlet pipe (8b) opens while being extended to a lower face of the sound deadening space and thereby constitutes the gas flow forming part.

7. Regarding claim 4, as shown in Fig. 5, Ide teaches that the outlet pipe (8b) extends in the plane of, and thus along, an upper end face (8d) of the sound deadening space.

8. Regarding claims 5 and 8-10, as shown in Fig. 13, Ide teaches that the lower face of the sound deadening space is constituted by a substantially horizontal face. Further, though Ide does not explicitly show the oil discharge opening, it would be provided at an end part of the lower face of the sound deadening space (note that end

part may refer to the face as a whole, in its capacity as the lower end of the sound deadening space).

9. Regarding claims 6, 7, and 11-13, Ide teaches that the suction muffler is formed with an annular gas passage between the outer wall (82) and the outlet pipe (8b).

10. Regarding claim 14, Ide teaches a visor (8f) which protrudes as an eaves above the discharge opening.

11. Regarding claim 15, Ide teaches that the opening of the outlet pipe (8b) is provided in the lower central portion (82) of the sound deadening space, which may be considered the thin part thereof.

12. Claims 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US PGPub 2004/0179955 to Lee (Lee).

13. Regarding claim 16, Lee teaches a hermetic compressor (100) comprising a hermetic container (500) for storing oil (paragraph 54) and a compressing element (300) in the container for compressing a refrigerant gas. Lee teaches that the compressing element (300) comprises a cylinder (31), a piston (34) reciprocating in the cylinder, and a compression chamber (31a) defined by the cylinder and piston. Lee further teaches a suction muffler (400) having a sound deadening space (45) defined within side walls (41, 42) and a bottom wall (in which 48 is formed). Lee teaches that the suction muffler comprises an inlet pipe (46) having an internal opening (at the top thereof) that opens into the sound deadening space (45) and an external opening (at the bottom thereof) for ingress of the refrigerant gas. Lee further teaches that the suction muffler comprises an outlet pipe (41) having an internal opening (41b) that opens into the sound deadening

space and an external opening (41a) for egress of the refrigerant to the compression chamber (see Fig. 1). Lee further teach an oil discharge opening (48) provided at a bottom part of the sound deadening space (45) adjacent the near sidewalls such that oil pooled near the junction of the sidewalls and bottom wall can discharge through the opening (48). Finally, Lee teaches that the internal opening of the inlet pipe is disposed in a location within the sound deadening space (45) so as to constitute a gas flow forming part that causes a flow of the refrigerant gas along the bottom part in a constant downward direction toward the oil discharge opening to cause the oil to pool thereat.

14. Regarding claim 17, Lee teaches that the internal opening of the inlet pipe is disposed so that the gas flow forming part causes the refrigerant gas to flow along a generally annular path (shown by the arrows in Fig. 4, the annular path is defined by the space between 41 and 42) within the sound deadening space (45).

15. Regarding claims 18 and 19, Lee teaches that the sound deadening space comprises an upper portion (defined by the cylindrical portion of 42) and a lower portion (47 and spherical transition from 42 to 47), the lower portion having a center portion (47) which is thinner than the side portions (hemispheres thereabove, delimited by any arbitrary diameter of the axial cross section) which are arranged on opposite sides of the central portion.

16. Regarding claim 20, Lee teaches a visor (43) which protrudes as an eaves above the oil discharge opening.

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments, see page 8, filed 18 February 2009, with respect to the drawings and indefiniteness have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection to the drawings and the rejection of claims 4, 6, and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112 have been withdrawn.

18. Applicant's further arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

19. With respect to the argument that Ide does not teach a constant direction, the examiner disagrees. The language of the claim does not require that the gas flow remain constant in direction through the sound deadening space, so constant direction at the inlet or outlet is deemed sufficient to meet the limitations of the claim. Further, the examiner notes that the annular gas path disclosed and claimed by the applicant is not, in some senses, a constant direction. Further, as noted above, the limitation of "a thin part of the sound deadening space" can be read very broadly to encompass the whole of any sound deadening space, as such may be considered "thin" in comparison to any appropriately selected other object that is less "thin." Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-13 over Ide is maintained.

Conclusion

20. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Stimpert whose telephone number is (571)270-1890. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30AM-4:00PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Devon Kramer can be reached on (571) 272-7118. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Devon C Kramer/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3746

/P. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 3746
8 May 2009